## **EXHIBIT 42**

N. 26

Transcript of Sched. Confr., Alliance for Retired Americans v. Bessent, No. 25-cv-00313 (D.D.C. Feb. 5, 2025)

| 1  |   |              |   |  |
|----|---|--------------|---|--|
| 1  | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA                       |              |   |  |
| 2  | FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  |              |   |  |
| 3  | * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * )   |              |   |  |
| 4  | ALLIANCE FOR RETIRED AMD et al.,  | ERICANS,     | ) Civil Action<br>) No. 25-00313                        |  |
| 5  | Plaintiffs,   |              | )   |  |
| 6  | VS.   |              | )   |  |
| 7  | SCOTT BESSENT, et al.,  |              | <pre>Washington, D.C. February 5, 2025 3:13 p.m. </pre> |  |
| 8  | Defendants.   |              |   |  |
| 9  | * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * )   |              |   |  |
| 10 |   |              |   |  |
| 11 | TRANSCRIPT OF SCHEDULING CONFERENCE BEFORE THE HONORABLE COLLEEN KOLLAR-KOTELLY |              |   |  |
| 12 | UNITED STATES SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE   |              |   |  |
| 13 |   |              |   |  |
| 14 | APPEARANCES:  |              |   |  |
| 15 |   |              | JOSHI, ESQ.<br>SANSONE, ESQ.                            |  |
| 16 |   | PUBLIC CIT   | 'IZEN LITIGATION GROUP<br>Street, Northwest             |  |
| 17 |   |              | n, D.C. 20009   |  |
| 18 | FOR THE DEFENDANTS:   |              | BRADLEY P. HUMPHREYS, ESQ. UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF  |  |
| 19 |   | JUSTICE      | reet, Northwest   |  |
| 20 |   |              | n, D.C. 20005   |  |
| 21 | REPORTED BY:  |              | RDS, RDR, CRR<br>Court Reporter                         |  |
| 22 |   | United Sta   | tes District Court for the cof Columbia                 |  |
| 23 |   |              | tution Avenue, Northwest                                |  |
| 24 |   |              | a, D.C. 20001   |  |
| 25 |   | (= 12 / 00 1 |   |  |
|    |   |              |   |  |

1 MR. HUMPHREYS: Well, we hope it will -- we hope 2 we'll get an opportunity to oppose in writing Plaintiffs' 3 motion and set things out more clearly there. 4 THE COURT: We will definitely be able to do that. 5 I'm trying to get a sense of what is involved because we 6 don't have many facts in terms of -- other than what's out 7 in the media, which obviously is not necessarily accurate. So I just wanted to get a sense of how complicated this was 8 9 in making a decision about how quickly you need to brief 10 this. 11 So --12 MR. HUMPHREYS: I mean, I think -- if I may, your 13 Honor, I mean, the crux of Plaintiffs' complaint, I believe, 14 is that this information in Treasury payment systems is being improperly disclosed to third parties. 15 16 THE COURT: Right. 17 MR. HUMPHREYS: And again, my understanding is 18 that that is not accurate. And so, you know, beyond that, 19 I'm not sure that other DOGE activities are necessarily 20 relevant to Plaintiffs' claims. 21 THE COURT: Well, as I said, I need to get a sense 22 of what is related to the records. 23 So Mr. Elez, in what form has he had the 24 disclosure of the records made to him? Does he have access

to them? He's gotten copies of them? What?

25

1 MR. HUMPHREYS: I believe that he has read-only 2 access to the system, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Okay. And has anybody received any copies of the records? 4 5 MR. HUMPHREYS: Not that I'm aware of, or at least 6 not that I'm aware of outside of the Treasury Department, 7 your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Let me ask one other question for a 9 second. What's the focus of any opposition on your part? 10 In other words, whatever you're going to be briefing, is 11 there a particular focus that -- obviously, you're going to 12 be responding to what they have put in their motion relating 13 to a TRO. But is there a particular focus that you have in 14 the briefing? 15 MR. HUMPHREYS: Well, certainly, your Honor. I 16 think there's very serious jurisdictional questions here as 17 to whether Plaintiffs can establish standing as an 18 organization or associational standing. You know, we think 19 on the merits -- we think fatally on all counts, your Honor. 20 We don't think they can establish irreparable injury that 21 would be required to entitle them to a TRO or that they're 22 likely to succeed on the merits. 23 THE COURT: What I was trying to get at is 24 sometimes there's a particular focus. Obviously, you're 25 going to go through the four elements that are required,